

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT	Application #	10/581,552
	Confirmation #	6221
	Filing Date	March 20, 2007
	First Inventor	WILSON
	Art Unit	2841
	Examiner	AYCHILLHUM
	Docket #	P08943US00/RFH

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

SIR:

The (second) restriction requirement contained in the Office Action of June 22, 2010 is hereby traversed. In the Action, restriction was required between:

Group I, claim(s) 1-26 drawn to a method of manufacturing an electrical component . . .

Group II, claim(s) 27-43, drawn to an electrical component . . . [See middle of page 2, underlining added.]

The reason given by the examiner for this restriction is that:

the groups listed above are not within the permitted combination of different categories of inventions. That is apparatuses and process of making product. [See bottom of page 2, emphasis added.]

However, it is clear from the examiner's statement of the restriction that the characterization of the electrical component as an "apparatus" is incorrect. As process claims are a "process for making a product", the examiner statement thus shows that the present process claims are a "method of manufacturing an electrical component" so that the electrical component of the present application is a **product**. Therefore, the electrical component claims 27-43 are not "apparatus" claims (as an apparatus for making a product, or more specifically an apparatus for making an electrical

component), but "product" claims [see MPEP 806.05(g) for the distinction between an apparatus and product made, and similar such distinctions].

As a result, what is claimed in the present application is a method of making a product (claims 1-26), and the product itself (claims 27-43). As set forth in 37 CFR 1.475,

(b) ... a national stage application containing claims to different categories of invention will be considered to have unity of invention if the claims are drawn only to one of the following combinations of categories:
(1) A product and a process specially adapted for the manufacture of said product; [Emphasis added.]

In view of this Rule which is directly applicable to the present groups of claims, this national stage application is entitled to have both categories of claims examined, so that withdrawal of the restriction requirement and examination of all claims 1-43 is again solicited.

As the reply to the restriction requirement must also contain a responsive election even when the restriction requirement is traversed, applicant hereby again elects apparatus claims 1-26 with the traverse as noted above.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 28, 2010

/Douglas E. Jackson/

Signed By Name: Douglas E. Jackson

Attorney of Record Registration No.: 28,518

STITES & HARBISON PLLC • 1199 North Fairfax St. • Suite 900 • Alexandria, VA 22314
TEL: 703-739-4900 • FAX: 703-739-9577 • CUSTOMER No. 881